DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 026 UD 017 361

TITLE	A Study of ESEA Title I in Selected School Districts in New York State.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Federal Education Opportunity Programs.
SPONS AGENCY	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; *Definitions; *Program Content; *Program Design; *Program Planning; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York

ABSTRACT

Prior experience with Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I programs has provided evidence that school districts are implementing supplementary programs funded by Title I which are separate and distinct from the base education programs. The focus of this study is on the relationship between the Title I supplementary programs and the base educational programs provided from state and local funds by the local school districts. It is based on questionnaire data and on two full-day conferences conducted in 1976. In order to define more clearly the reasons why this type of educational program was designed by local school districts and to document the attributes and significant characteristics of these compensatory education programs, the conferences explored, with local school district personnel, the three basic approaches used by school districts to deliver Title I services to children during the day. The primary issue identified was that the program's federal status, seemed to require the creation of a Title I program which is literally divorced from the program provided for children by the local school district since any blending of the two programs might cause the appearance of supplanting state and local funds with federal funds. These two characteristics of the federal statutes; that the Title I services could not supplant state and local funds and that the Title I services had to be supplementary, have, in fact, promoted a series of program designs which began a fragmented and often detrimental model of educational planning and instructional modalities. The implications of this situation are discussed. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

The State Education Department

The Institute for Educational Leadership

ED145026

UP

A STUDY OF ESEA TITLE I IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN NEW YORK STATE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

The New York State Education Dept.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UDO 17861

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
The Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation
The Division of Federal Education Opportunity Programs
Albany, New York 12234

1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1981	Theodore M. Black, A. B., Litt. D., LL. D., Pd. D., D. C. L., L. H. D., Chancellor	Sands Point
1987	Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A. B., M. B. A., D. C. S., H. H. D., Vice Chancellor	Purchase
1978	Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL. D., Litt. D.	Troy
1986	Kenneth B. Clark, A. B., M. S., Ph. D., LL. D., L. H. D., D. Sc.	Hastings on Hudson
1983	Harold E. Newcomb, B. A.	Owego
1988	Willard A. Genrich, LL. B., L. H. D., LL. D.	Buffalo
1982	Emlyn I. Griffith, A. B., J. D.	Rome
1983	Mary Alice Kendall, B. S.	Irondequoit
1984	Jorge L. Batista, B. A., J. D., LL. D.	Bronx
1982	Louis E. Yavner, LL. B.	New York
1979	Laura B. Chodos, B. A., M. A.	Clifton Park
1980	Martin C. Barell, B. A., I. A., LL. B.	Kings Point
1981	Joseph R. Bongiorno, B. S., M. D.	Brooklyn
1984	Louise P. Matteoni, B. A., M. A., Ph. D.	Bayside
1981	J. Edward Meyer, B. A., LL. B.	Chappaqua

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
Gordon M. Ambach

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education
Thomas D. Sheldon

Assistant Commissioner for Program Analysis and Evaluation
Gerald L. Freeborne

Coordinator of Federal and State Education Opportunity Programs and Office of Urban School Services
Sterling S. Keyes

Director, Division of Federal Education Opportunity Programs
John L. House

Chief, Bureau of Federal Education Opportunity Programs
William F. Flannigan

Chief, Bureau of Federal Education Opportunity Programs
Paul M. Hughes

The Institute for Educational Leadership

New York State Education Department

Study of Title I in

Selected New York State School Districts

FOREWORD

The following study of E. S. E. A., Title I, conducted by the State Education Department in selected school districts in New York State, was sponsored by a grant from the Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D. C. The Institute is currently conducting a major National Study of compensatory education under a grant from the National Institute for Education.

The New York State study is one part of the larger national study. The findings and conclusions in this report are related only to the New York State study, and are in no way to be interpreted as the findings and conclusions of the Institute for Educational Leadership. The Institute will consider the New York State report, along with all other reports, in developing its final recommendations to the NIE and to the Congress.

The study was conducted and the report was prepared by the two staff members of the Office for Program Analysis and Evaluation and the Division of Federal Education Opportunity Programs.

The report is distributed for your consideration. The Department welcomes your written reactions to the report.

Executive Summary

Consistent with the New York State Education Department's policy of periodic review of compensatory education programs in local school districts, the Department sought and received a small grant from the Institute for Educational Leadership in the Spring of 1976 to initiate and conduct a limited but important study of a critical educational issue regarding the E.S.E.A. Title I program in New York State. The focus of the Study, which included the distribution of questionnaires and two full-day conferences during the month of October 1976, was the relationship between the Title I supplementary program and the base education program provided from State and local funds by the local school districts. Prior experience with the Title I program, especially through the on-site monitoring of projects, provided ample evidence that school districts were implementing supplementary programs funded by Title I which were separate and distinct from the base education program. In an effort to define more clearly the reasons why this type of educational program was designed by local school districts and to document the attributes and significant characteristics of these compensatory education programs, the conferences sponsored by the Department and funded by IEL explored with local school district personnel the three basic approaches utilized by school districts to deliver Title I services to children during the school day.

The Study was not conducted according to classic research principles because of the shortage both of time and resources. The Study confined itself to the process of gathering information and ideas from knowledgeable local

school district personnel who are the daily practitioners of Title I. The sample of districts which participated in the Study was small and, therefore, the conclusions which can be drawn from the collected data are limited in both scope and application.

The questionnaires and conferences provided pertinent information from a variety of informed personnel regarding the rationale for the design and implementation of Title I programs. The primary issue identified by the conference participants was that the federal statute, particularly Part D, Sec. 141 (a)(3)(B) and the regulation § 116.40 a (2),[1/] seemed to require the creation of a Title I program which is literally divorced from the program provided for children by the local school district since any blending of the two programs might cause the appearance of supplanting State and local funds with federal funds. In an effort to reduce the suspicion of supplanting, a system was devised whereby Title I students are removed from the regular classroom and provided with supplementary services by Title I personnel in an area distant from the classroom. Since the services provided by Title I had also to be supplementary it was easy to assume that these services had to

---

1/ "...(B) Federal funds made available under this title will be so used (i) as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the education of pupils participating in programs and projects assisted under this title, and (ii) in no case, as to supplant such funds from non-Federal sources,..." Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies to Meet the Special Educational Needs of Educationally Deprived, Neglected and Delinquent Children. Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 189 - Tuesday, September 28, 1976.

be different. These two characteristics of the federal statute and regulations, that the Title I services could not supplant State and local funds and that the Title I services had to be supplementary, have, in fact, promoted a series of program designs which inaugurated a fragmented and often detrimental model of educational planning and instructional modalities.

While it is agreed by most educators and administrators that the federal regulations should retain a provision against the arbitrary supplanting of State and local funds with special federal funds for disadvantaged children, it is also imperative to provide enough flexibility to school districts in the language of such a provision to allow for a more educationally sound and fiscally proven approach to Title I program planning. Based on the evidence presented in this report, the New York State Education Department urges that federal officials reexamine the ESEA Title I legislation in terms of its impact on disadvantaged students. Clearly the federal government had fine intentions when it enacted Title I but the unintended educational consequences that have resulted now require extensive examination before the act is re-authorized.

In the absence of such a change in the wording of the federal regulations it is suggested that the State Education Department publish a series of guidelines to local school districts which include a list of acceptable practices and procedures which could be used by local school districts in the planning and implementation of Title I programs. In the past most guidelines have contained admonitions and negative directives warning school districts what they are specifically prohibited from doing. It would seem an appropriate and positive step to revise this trend by issuing a set of permissible practices

which local school districts could undertake to strengthen their Title I programs and still, by the overt judgment of the State, remain within the legal boundaries of the federal regulations.

It is also suggested that the State hold a series of regional conferences or a statewide conference on the subject of testing and evaluation in the Title I program. It was evident from the questionnaires and conference discussions that there is serious concern by local school districts regarding current testing requirements and evaluation policies.

I. Introduction

In 1965, the Federal government began a large-scale national effort to improve educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged children residing in economically depressed areas. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides financial assistance to local education agencies to assist them in providing supplementary educational services in order to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Within New York State, local school districts receive approximately $200 million annually for special programs and projects authorized under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The administration of the Title I program involves a partnership among the Federal government, State Education Agencies and local education agencies. On the Federal level, the program is administered through the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Through a series of rules, regulations and guidelines that have been periodically updated since 1965, program policy has been defined with respect to the intent of the Congress. State governments through their established education agencies are responsible for insuring that local education agencies within a state use Title I funds consistent with applicable law, rules, regulations and guidelines. State Education Agencies are required to provide technical assistance to local education agencies and to annually review and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and projects funded under Title I. Local education agencies are responsible for conducting a needs assessment to determine the incidence and severity of educational

deprivation within the district; selecting project areas and target groups within those areas for the provision of compensatory education services; and, finally, developing, operating and evaluating projects which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in the designated attendance areas and which are sufficient in size, scope and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress in meeting those needs.

Early national reviews and evaluations of the impact of Title I programs were generally inconclusive regarding the effectiveness of meeting the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children. In the early years many Title I projects were often loosely structured and were designed to meet a variety of economic, social and cultural needs of disadvantaged children rather than providing direct instructional services for the remediation of academic skills. More recent evaluation reports, however, have been more positive in documenting the impact on the academic achievement of participating children. Recent surveys have also indicated a significant improvement in the administration of Title I projects by local school districts.

A variety of technical problems, however, continue to influence the annual evaluation of Title I projects. These problems include, among others, the criteria for success, representativeness of samples, appropriateness of tests, and methodological problems with analysis and interpretation of test results.

Since the inception of Title I in 1965, the New York State Education Department has been actively involved in efforts to strengthen and improve compensatory education programs. In 1973, as a result of a comprehensive review of compensatory education programs, the State Education Department established the basic skills of reading and mathematics (including bilingual instruction where appropriate) as the priorities for the expenditure of Title I funds, and for the expenditure of New York State's own compensatory education funds. The State recognized then, as it does now, the critical importance of basic skills. The current review of the Title I program, as described in the remainder of this document, reflects the State's continued commitment to strengthening both State and local compensatory education programs. Given the mixed and inconclusive national evaluation results after 10 years of Title I, plus the substantial level of resources that have been devoted to this important effort, continued attention must be directed at the basic, fundamental issues related to current compensatory education policies.

II. The State Education Department - Institute for Educational Leadership Study of Compensatory Education

During 1977, the United States Congress will begin reconsideration of the legislation authorizing compensatory education programs currently funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965 (as amended). The present authorizing legislation expires on June 30, 1978. Prior to the passage of new authorizing legislation, the Administration and the Congress will undoubtedly review the past accomplishments of the Title I program. A variety of studies are currently underway, many of which have been authorized by the Congress, and are to be completed prior to reconsideration of the legislation.

The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) in Washington, D.C. has been authorized by the U.S. Office of Education to conduct a national study of Title I. The objectives of the IEL "Compensatory Education Policy Project" are:

- "To increase understanding among educational leadership of the successes, weaknesses and potential of federal and state compensatory programs;
- To encourage greater integration of federal and state programs dealing with similar clientele;
- To solicit professional, educational and political counsel regarding the compensatory education provisions of federal legislation, especially ESEA Title I and the concomitant administrative regulations".

The IEL has funded a series of small grants for special studies that address policy issues related to the Title I program. Upon completion of these studies, the IEL will submit a final report to USOE identifying the substantive findings. The IEL also anticipates the dissemination of the findings to key policymakers at both the federal and state levels for review and discussion. The outcomes of this project should provide valuable information and assistance to policymakers as legislative changes are contemplated.

In March of 1976, the IEL contacted the New York State Education Department and requested that the Department submit a proposal for funding which would be reflective of the issues to be examined in the national study, and which would also be of primary concern and relevance to New York State's Title I experience. Such a proposed study was submitted to the IEL in April of 1976. The original deadline for completion of the study was the end of September 1976. The Department, due to both time and resource constraints, selected a limited study of critical issues which significantly influence the design and implementation of compensatory education programs. Shortly after its submission, the proposal was accepted by the IEL. The work on the study began in May 1976.

The Department's proposal included a problem statement identifying the primary area of concern that would be addressed by the study. The selected area for examination was the relationship of the Title I supplementary program to the base education program of the local school district.

Professional observations and monitoring visits to Title I programs across the State provided evidence to indicate that the Title I programs operated by school districts were not well integrated with the base education programs. The Department hypothesized that under existing law, regulations and guidelines, it was very difficult for local school districts to fully integrate compensatory education programs with base education programs without running the risk of non-compliance with regulations, particularly in terms of supplanting State and local funds. The basic assumption made was that the more integrated supplemental services provided by Title I were with the base education program, the more difficult it would be to prove that the services were directed specifically to the target population, and that the supplemental services did not, in fact, supplant the services provided through State and local funds. It was further hypothesized that many school districts, constrained by such regulatory language, had chosen to clearly demarcate Title I services from the base school program in order to overtly demonstrate compliance with the regulations. This type of educational program planning, while ostensibly satisfying the legal requirement for the accountability of distinct supplemental services to Title I students, often resulted in the implementation of instructional programs which were isolated from the students' base education program, and which severely fragmentized the continuity of instruction for Title I students.

Given the basic problem statement that compensatory education programs were not well integrated with base education programs, the Department proposed a two-phase study design to test whether the problem existed

and, if it did, whether the problem was large enough to constitute a significant impediment to effective compensatory education program planning and implementation.

Phase I of the study was designed to elicit basic information on the issues identified in the proposal. The methodology outlined in the original proposal called for the interviewing of various individuals in selected school districts in order to obtain firsthand information from those individuals who are the most directly involved in the daily administration of the Title I program. Different sets of questions were developed for administrators, principals, Title I teachers and classroom teachers. Because of time constraints and the difficulty of arranging interview schedules in local school districts late in the school year, it was necessary to forego actual on-site interviews. In place of the interviews, questionnaires were developed to be filled out by the selected individuals.

Phase II of the study consisted of the convening of a seminar to review the information gathered in Phase I, comment on substantive findings and develop recommendations, if appropriate. The intent of the seminar was to explore in greater depth the issues which emerged in the questionnaires and, through discussion, it was anticipated that a balanced perspective of the Title I experience would emerge.

The Education Department assigned two staff members to complete the study. One individual works for the Division of Federal Education Opportunity Programs, which administers the Title I program, while the second individual works in the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation. The small grant award received from the IEL was used entirely to defray conference costs associated with Phase II of the study.

III. Phase I - Information Gathering

Four separate questionnaires were developed to collect information from school personnel. These questionnaires (included as Appendix A) were for Title I teachers, classroom teachers, school building principals and district administrators. While the questionnaires differed somewhat according to the responsibilities of the individuals for whom they were intended, the basic focus of all the questionnaires was essentially the same. The questionnaires were not principally designed to gather quantifiable data but were designed to elicit information from the daily practitioners of Title I administration.

The primary intent of the questionnaires was to have individuals identify and explain how children are selected for Title I services, how supplemental services are provided to the children, and, ultimately, how and when a determination is made that children no longer require the Title I program. The questionnaires particularly stressed the exchange of information among individuals working with a Title I child, the coordination of the child's educational program among these individuals and the identification of the individual or individuals who are involved in making decisions with respect to the child's educational progress.

It was determined by the staff that the questionnaires should be administered to personnel in large urban school districts where a significant number of school children were participating in Title I projects since these school districts, which annually receive sizable allocations of Title I funds, traditionally experience a multitude of administrative, programmatic and

evaluative difficulties because of the size and complexity of the Title I programs. It was also decided to choose at least one small rural school district in which to administer the questionnaires to determine if the same or similar problems existed in a school district with a small number of educationally disadvantaged children and a relatively low Title I allocation.

Five school districts[2/] were contacted to determine if they would be willing to participate in Phase I of the study. The five districts, including two large Community School Districts in New York City, and two large city and one small city school districts Upstate all agreed to participate. Arrangements were then made for the study staff to visit each of the districts.

The procedures used in all districts were the same. The study staff met initially with the coordinator of the Title I program for the district. The basic purpose of the study was explained and the questionnaires were reviewed. Each coordinator was asked to select two eligible Title I school buildings for the actual administration of the questionnaires. In each building visited, a meeting was held with the principal to explain the study. Each principal was asked to fill out a questionnaire and (s)he was asked to select five Title I teachers and five classroom teachers to fill out the teacher questionnaires. Individuals were requested to complete the questionnaires and return them by mail to the Department.

2/ The school districts who participated were: Albany, Syracuse, Gloversville, Community School District #3, and Community School District #7, both located in New York City.

Of the questionnaires distributed, eighty were completed and returned, representing a rate-of-return of approximately 70%. Sixty-four teacher questionnaires were returned with a fairly even split between Title I teachers and classroom teachers (34 to 30).

The format of the questionnaire, except for a few very specific questions, was essentially open-ended, allowing for either short, one-sentence responses or more lengthy detailed responses. In general, respondents tended towards larger responses for most questions. Because of the nature of the questions and the types of responses that were generated, it was most difficult to categorize responses in any meaningful way that would lend itself to simple statistical interpretation. It was the opinion of staff that such an approach would inadequately convey the information contained in the questionnaires. Therefore, rather than quantifying the data into tables and frequency charts it was decided to review all the responses from the questionnaires in order to develop a set of issues or agenda items that could be fully discussed in the Phase II conference portion of the study.

The completed questionnaires provided an excellent source of information from local school district personnel concerning the operations and administration of the Title I program in their school districts. The remainder of this report identifies and describes the opinions, observations and statements made by local school district personnel about a multitude of problems and concerns regarding the Title I program. It is subjective and experiential information. As such, it does not always reflect the accuracy of official

State Education Department policies and procedures. Likewise, it does not always reflect the policies and procedures which are consistent with applicable Federal rules, regulations and guidelines. The information does, however, reflect the deep concern of school district personnel regarding the Title I program and it does represent, in those districts which participated in the Study, the perceptions and understandings of school district personnel who are directly responsible for designing, implementing and evaluating Title I programs. Since only ten (10) school districts participated in Phase I and Phase II of the Study the conclusions which can be drawn from the data, while valid for those districts which participated, are limited and tentative in application to the more than seven hundred (700) school districts in the State of New York which receive annual Title I allocations.

While the number of school districts which participated in the Study is very small it is important to note that the participating school districts are among those districts which receive the largest Title I allocations in the State of New York. Since the primary purpose of the study was to gather and analyze information from local school district personnel regarding a critical educational issue prompted by the language of the Title I legislation it was felt that the narrative description of the recorded information should be presented clearly, concisely and objectively. Thus, there was no attempt on the part of the study team to editorialize on comments and observations made by participants in the Study even though, at times, what was said by conference participants and respondents of the questionnaires did not accurately reflect

the enunciated policies of the State Education Department. The Study, therefore, emphasized what is, rather than what should be. While the gathering of information and ideas from local school district personnel by the State Education Department was certainly not a unique approach, it was, in some instances, a departure from traditional methods of classic research principles since there was no overt attempt to regulate the information or discussions by rigid preset parameters.

The analysis of the questionnaires from an issue perspective led to the identification of three major areas of concern. The first concern was the coordination and articulation of Title I supplementary educational services with the base classroom education program. Evidence of this as an issue appeared in responses to a variety of the questions as well as in supplementary comments submitted with the questionnaires. One of the questions asked specifically what steps have been taken to establish coordination and continuity between the Title I and base education program. The vast majority of those responding indicated that coordination occurred through periodic meetings and conferences of the instructional staff on the progress of the participants in the Title I program. The responses failed to indicate, however, how the instructional programs were coordinated. A large number of respondents either left the question blank or indicated that they did not know. Additional evidence of this issue appeared on the teacher questionnaires where Title I teachers were asked how often, and to whom, they reported on the progress of the children. Classroom teachers were asked how often they received

progress reports on Title I children. The responses to "how often" information exchange occurred varied widely. Some indicated that information was exchanged daily while others indicated once or twice a year and there was a full range in between. There clearly was no evidence of any standard, universal patterns of information exchange and coordination of education programs for Title I students, even within a single school building.

The second major area of concern that emerged dealt with the entire concept of "supplemental" services, and how that concept is operationalized in the limited time frame of a typical school day. This issue, as with the previous issue, did not emerge as a result of a single question, but surfaced in response to a variety of questions, as well as in additional comments on the questionnaires. The most frequent comment made was that the "pull-out" of Title I children from the classroom for purposes of the supplementary program created a loss of continuity of classwork which negatively affected both Title I students and non-Title I students. Furthermore, a variety of problems and difficulties specifically related to "pull-out" programs were identified, including the following:

- Children taken out of the regular class for Title I services "lose" regular class instruction.
- Reading skills being taught in supplementary classes are not reinforced in regular class content area subjects.

- Disadvantaged students are frequently in multiple supplemental programs (reading, math, communication skills, etc.) leading to excessive loss of regular class time and activities.
- The responsibility for a child's educational development in a given subject (i.e. reading) is split between the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher. Such division of responsibility creates confusion and uncertainty.
- Children in supplemental programs often miss interesting, and often motivational, "fun" activities such as music, art and science.
- The "pull-out" approach requires an inordinate amount of conference time and mutual planning activities on the part of the instructional staff which in many instances subtracts from the time available for direct instruction to children.

The third major area of concern expressed by the respondents was the heavy use of standardized, norm-referenced testing instruments as the most important criterion for determining whether or not children receive Title I services. Many respondents expressed a lack of confidence that these tests accurately reflect a student's ability and performance in the classroom. Others indicated that the use of such tests inhibits the development of programs at earlier ages where supplemental assistance might be most effective in helping disadvantaged children. Teachers pointed out that students receiving supplemental services had to be dropped from programs when their standardized

test scores rose above a certain cutoff point even though, in the teacher's judgment, the student still needed additional assistance. It was indicated that quite often after the supplemental assistance was terminated, a student's test score would drop and he would be picked up for Title I programming in the succeeding year. 3/ Finally, teachers felt that more flexibility should be allowed to use teacher judgment as opposed to sole reliance on standardized test scores.

The information obtained from the questionnaires was useful for identifying areas of concern to be discussed more fully in the conferences. The responses tended to substantiate the original problem statement concerning the relationship of the Title I program to the base education program.

3/ New Title I regulations released in September 1976 specifically state that cutoff scores for retention of students in Title I programs can differ from entry scores. The new regulations should reduce to some degree the specific problem noted above.

IV. Phase II - Conferences

Phase II of the study involved the convening of conferences of professional educators and administrators from local school districts. The intent was to solicit the opinion, counsel and advice of practitioners who work with the children on a daily basis in the schools and who, because of their knowledge and experience, are intimately familiar with compensatory education programming as it is operationalized in the school building and the classroom. The focus was clearly on the practitioner's point of view of what works and what doesn't work with children.

Many variables were considered during the planning for the organization and conduct of the conferences. The more important of these are as follows:

1. It was considered most important to include district staff of compensatory education programs as well as school-based personnel. Therefore, Title I administrators and Title I teachers were invited as were classroom teachers, principals, program coordinators and supervisors funded from State and local funds. The objective was to obtain a balanced discussion of children's educational needs and how those needs might best be met in the school regardless of program label or designation.

2. A decision was made to hold two conferences - one in Albany for Upstate school districts and one in New York City for Community School Districts. Five school districts were invited to send representatives to each of the conferences. It had been decided to request the school districts which had participated in Phase I of the Study to send representatives to Phase II. In this way a continuity of input from the same districts could be established. In order to maximize the diversity of opinion at the conferences, however, it was decided to request two (2) additional school districts Upstate and three (3) additional New York City community school districts to send representatives to the conferences. These additional school districts were selected because of the large numbers of educationally deprived children residing in the districts and the annual Title I allocations (each exceeding one million dollars) to each of the districts. The Albany conference included the four large city school districts of Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Albany and the smaller city district of Gloversville. The New York City conference included Community School Districts 3, 7, 13, 14 and 28, all of which are large, urban districts. It was felt that two conferences were necessary in order to achieve fairly large representation, yet not so large as to preclude free and vigorous dialogue.

3. Given the fairly large number of participants that would be attending each conference plus the desire to have participants engage in substantive dialogue of issues, the decision was made to divide the participants into small groups for the purpose of discussion. It was the opinion of staff that the most appropriate grouping would be by type of responsibility. Accordingly, four separate discussion groups were formed in each conference. The four groups were teachers (both classroom and Title I), principals, supervisors (both reading and math) and Title I coordinators.

The Albany conference of Upstate districts was held on October 7, 1976. All five invited districts sent representatives with a total of 50 participants in attendance. The New York City conference was held on October 21, 1976 and included 42 participants from the five districts. The New York City conference also included 8 individuals from the staff of the Central Board of Education. State Education Department representatives numbered 11 at the Albany conference and 21 at the New York City conference.

The design of the format for discussion at the conference came as a result of the review of the questionnaires. In the questionnaire responses, school personnel had identified three major but fundamentally different ways of organizing and delivering instructional services to disadvantaged children.

The first approach, and the one that appears to be most prevalent in the school districts represented at the conference, is most commonly referred to as the "remedial pull-out" approach. The typical arrangements

under this approach are that eligible children are "pulled out" of their home classroom for some period of time during the school day at which time they receive remedial instruction in the priority areas of reading and/or math. The remedial program is supplemental because the child receives his regular classroom instruction in the particular skill area(s) which is then supplemented by a second period of instruction in the compensatory program. The supplementary portion of the program is generally given by, or is under the direction of, a professional compensatory education teacher, and it may include the use of teaching assistants or aides who work under the supervision of the professional.

The second approach that was identified is referred to as "in-class remediation". This approach differs from the first approach in that the compensatory education services for eligible children are delivered in the children's home classroom, and the children do not leave their classroom. Typical arrangements under this broad approach include: supplemental services provided by teaching aides or assistants who work under the direction of the classroom teacher; certain team teaching arrangements where one of the team members provides the supplemental services to eligible children within a defined plan; and compensatory education professionals acting in the capacity of resource people to classroom teachers.

The third approach is referred to as "the target class", in which eligible compensatory education students receive their instruction in all subject areas from a compensatory education specialist. "Target classes"

would be smaller and more individualized than regular classes and would include additional materials and, possibly, additional teaching aides or assistants. The intent of the "target class" approach would be to provide an intensive short-term program to disadvantaged students in order to raise their academic skills to the point where they could reenter the base school program with little, or no, additional supplementary assistance. At present, this approach is not allowed to be funded exclusively with ESEA, Title I funds since it would constitute the supplanting of State or local monies.

It was the opinion of the study staff that a useful way of organizing conference discussions of the Title I program would be to examine and discuss the advantages and disadvantages associated with each of the three major approaches. The primary reasons for choosing these items for discussion were as follows:

1. It was felt that a discussion of alternatives would evoke a wider, more substantive and open discussion of what types of compensatory education options work best for children. Discussion of alternatives was viewed as one way of insuring that the viewpoints of all individuals, whatever their area of responsibility, were expressed and discussed. It was anticipated, for example, that any one individual or group of individuals who favored a certain approach to the delivery of compensatory education could identify the positive aspects of the favored approach, and, at the same time, identify the

negative aspects of all other approaches. If, in fact, this occurred, it would increase the likelihood that a rather full range of strengths and weaknesses would be identified for each of three major approaches addressed.

2. The assumption was made that no single approach to compensatory education is most effective under all circumstances and in all settings. Thus, in identifying three alternatives for discussion, there was no presumption or intent that any one alternative would be clearly superior to any other alternative. The more important objective was to identify for each of the alternatives the full range of strengths and weaknesses as perceived by individuals who are involved in and operate the programs. Such a list of strengths and weaknesses for each of the three approaches would be valuable for local school districts in the future planning of Title I programs.

Materials sent to all conference participants prior to the conference included a four-page discussion outline which indicated that the participants would be discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the three alternative approaches to compensatory education. It was indicated that discussion of the alternatives would provide an organizing focus for the conference, but that participants should feel free to identify and discuss any other issues that may be of concern.

The structure and agenda for both the Albany and the New York City conferences were identical. A half-hour general session was held which included all participants. The general session was conducted by the Assistant Commissioner for Program Analysis and Evaluation, and included introductory remarks concerning the purpose of the study, an overview of the results of the questionnaires, and an explanation of the format for the conference discussions. After the general session, the participants divided into four small discussion groups consisting of teachers, principals, Title I coordinators and supervisors. Each group was asked to identify and discuss the positive and negative aspects of the three major approaches. The small group discussions lasted for approximately three hours. A final, general session of all participants was held where a representative of each group reported on the discussions and recommendations of the group. There was a short time devoted to additional discussion after which the conference closed.

A State Education Department representative was assigned to each discussion group to act as a moderator. An additional SED staff member was assigned to record the discussions of the group. One of the participants in each small group was selected to provide a summary report to the full group in the general session.

The discussions from both the Upstate and New York City conferences were recorded and studied. Since more similarities than differences were noted for each group in their discussions of the three approaches and since

no discernible differences were noted between Upstate and New York City, it was decided to present the data under each approach regardless of group or region. Other items that were discussed and were not directly related to the agenda are also reported in this section.

1. Approach #1 - "Remedial, pull-out" program

A clear majority of individuals representing school districts at both conferences operated within the context of the "remedial pull-out" approach. The positive aspects identified by participants are as follows:

- It enables more individualization and attention to each child's needs.
- It provides for a diagnostic/prescriptive approach for each individual.
- It enables a controlled environment with less distraction.
- It allows for the increased utilization of special materials and equipment.
- It is easier for scheduling purposes.
- It allows for multiple age/grade groupings.
- The small-group instruction reduces peer competition.
- The individualization often makes the child feel he is "special" and can lead to increased motivation.

- This approach enables districts and professionals to maintain integrity in the sense that the programs and services are easily identifiable, and are relatively easy to monitor with respect to present legislation.

The negative aspects of the pull-out approach, as identified by the participants, are as follows:

- It tends to negatively "label" children.
- Child may resent being removed from his classroom if he is forced to miss a favorite subject or activity.
- It disrupts the regular classroom routine.
- It often creates confusion for the child because he is unable to relate his classroom activities to his Title I activities.
- It usually focuses on specific skills but does not provide content area application.
- Children deficient in one area are frequently deficient in other areas, and are enrolled in multiple remedial programs. The children miss a tremendous amount of class time and are continually moved around from class to class.

- The approach creates a split responsibility between the classroom and compensatory teacher for the child's progress in a given area. This creates confusion and leads to the feeling on the part of both professionals that neither one is fully responsible.
- The approach creates coordination problems between the compensatory and classroom teachers. Sufficient planning and coordination time is rarely available which frequently results in little or no coordination of instructional activities.

2. Approach #2 - "In-class remediation"

A number of individuals indicated that this second approach was used in their districts, but it was evident, at least among the districts represented, that this approach was much less frequently used than the "pull-out" approach. The positive aspects of this approach are as follows:

- It provides classroom stability for students.
- It provides for the training of teachers by Title I specialists in the classroom.
- The classroom teacher retains sole responsibility for each child's progress in all areas.
- It allows for the application and reinforcement of skill training in a given subject area and across all other content areas.

- The students are not "pulled out" and therefore do not miss regular class activities.

The negative aspects of this approach are as follows:

- There is a tendency toward Title I services becoming "general aid".
- The eligible Title I students are frequently given to untrained paraprofessionals for remedial work while the classroom teacher works with the non-Title I students.
- It minimizes opportunities for use of special materials and equipment.
- Personality conflicts between classroom teachers and Title I staff occur.
- Many teachers indicated they do not feel comfortable, nor can they operate well, with additional personnel in the room. Most frequently cited were problems of distraction and confusion over specific responsibilities such as discipline and grading.
- Individuals indicated that a major difficulty in implementing this approach was a lack of adequate space and small classroom size. The lack of space is not a negative aspect of the approach itself, but rather it is a constraint that often prohibits the use of an in-classroom remediation approach.

3. Approach #3 - "Target class"

The target class approach was identified as one of the alternatives for discussion because it appeared in a number of questionnaire responses, although such an approach, if funded exclusively with Title I monies is currently not allowable. Respondents indicated that the target class approach, even with some of its obvious difficulties, would be preferable to the "pull-out" approach. Proponents of the "target class" approach indicated that it would eliminate coordination problems, would allow the child to remain in his home classroom for all instruction which would enable skill reinforcement across all content areas and would incorporate greater individualization, and the increased use of a wide variety of materials.

This approach, however, was firmly rejected by all groups in both conferences. It was felt that the very real possibilities of racial and social class isolation as well as the stigma attached to being in a "target class" were negative aspects which far outweighed any potential positive aspects associated with the approach.

In both the Upstate and New York City conferences, individuals identified another basic approach to providing compensatory education services which, in the opinion of the participants, constituted a fourth alternative. The basic procedure of this fourth approach was that a classroom teacher would take all of the students in the class to a resource lab for a given period of time

during the day. The resource lab would be staffed with Title I-funded specialists who would work with the Title I students while the classroom teacher would work with the non-Title I students. The Title I students would not miss any classroom activities; the whole-class approach would reduce, or eliminate, the "labeling" associated with the "pull-out" approach; coordination between the compensatory and classroom teachers would be improved; and the lab setting would provide an opportunity for inservice training of classroom teachers. Most participants reacted favorably to the lab approach.

Other Items Discussed

1. Most participants argued strongly in favor of increased flexibility in the use of Title I resources at the school building level. The general feeling was that current restrictions preclude direct decision making at the building level. One suggestion offered was that either the State or federal government develop about 6-10 approvable approaches for the delivery of Title I services which could be selected at the building level. Not all participants, however, agreed on increased flexibility at the building level. Some individuals, particularly from New York City, expressed the opinion that given the current fiscal crisis, greater flexibility at the building level might reduce the concentration of Title I resources on eligible students, and that the resources would be used as "general aid".

2. There was a strong feeling among participants that the methods of selecting students for entry into the program as well as exit from the program were too rigid and inflexible. Most indicated that a cutoff score (i.e., 23rd percentile) on a standardized test determined whether a child received Title I services or did not. Teachers indicated that students who could not read had to take a test to determine eligibility. They also indicated that some students who clearly needed help scored above the cutoff point and were therefore ineligible for Title I services, while other students who were, in the teacher's judgment, less in need scored below the cutoff point, and, therefore, received services. Another area of concern pertained to students in Title I programs who, at the end of the year, score slightly above the cutoff point and, therefore, are not retained in the program since they are no longer considered eligible. These students are dropped from the Title I program but in the following year their test scores again drop below grade level in which case they, in the following year, re-enter the Title I program. This phenomenon appeared common in many districts and was referred to as the "yo-yo" effect. This was one area where school personnel felt that by allowing more flexibility at the school building level these problems could be eliminated.

3. A number of concerns were expressed about evaluation. One area frequently mentioned was that the evaluation requirement of annual pre-post testing locked children into a full-year program whether or not it was needed. It was also indicated that this requirement made it difficult, if not impossible, to assist children during the year who might require only short-term assistance. Even the use of criterion-referenced testing does not seem to alleviate the problem. Many complained about giving tests for evaluation purposes to children who could not read. Bilingual teachers indicated that few appropriate tests were available for children with limited English language skills. Math teachers indicated that some math tests required reading skills which many children do not have, and, therefore, were inappropriate as measures of math achievement. In general, participants felt that too much emphasis and weight were given to standardized test scores, exclusive of other indicators of educational progress.

4. Participants questioned current definitions and interpretations of what constitutes "supplementing" and what is regarded as "supplanting". Many participants felt that it was most difficult, if not impossible, to "supplement" during the school day, and that, strictly speaking, Title I programs would have to be outside regular school hours to be considered truly "supplemental". It was pointed out that children receiving "supplemental" services are at the same time missing regular class activities funded from State and local resources.

Many participants felt that the State's interpretation of supplanting is much too restrictive and results in the implementing of programs which appear to be legal, but which are, in fact, of dubious legality and of questionable educational value. It was also noted by many participants that the State appeared to be inconsistent in its application of policy regarding what is and is not allowable in Title I programs. Examples were given where a procedure in one district was considered supplanting while in another district it was not.

5. Participants felt that insufficient emphasis is given to early intervention at the pre-K or kindergarten level. A fairly strong feeling existed that compensatory services can be more productive with children at early ages. Many were of the opinion that the regulation on evaluation standards which stressed the measurement of educational achievement with regards to objective standards or norms tended to direct the resources to students in later grades where deficiencies in academic achievement can be clearly documented. It was pointed out that it is much more difficult to "objectively" document such needs at early ages even though teachers and principals felt that they could identify children who, in their opinion, would benefit from supplemental assistance. This was another area where individuals indicated that increased flexibility should be allowed at the school building level.

6. Another problem frequently cited by participants is where children receiving supplemental services must forfeit some classroom activity, yet no priorities have been established by the local district with respect to what the child could or should miss. The same problem was noted with students who are enrolled in multiple compensatory programs (i.e., reading, math, communication skills, etc.). Many felt that the attempt to deal with all deficiencies simultaneously was not productive and students missed inordinate amounts of regular classwork which only exacerbated the problems.

7. Many individuals felt that more attention and resources should be devoted to teacher and paraprofessional training.

8. Many participants noted the conspicuous absence of longitudinal studies in the Title I program. Individuals indicated the need to determine what happens to children after they leave the program. In addition, it was indicated that the annual evaluation of programs was not sufficient to determine effectiveness without looking at long-term growth.

9. Participants felt that regulations inhibited or precluded certain approaches which might prove to be more effective ways of delivering compensatory education services to disadvantaged children. One example given which is currently not allowed would be to allow the professional or paraprofessional funded under Title I to work with non-Title I students while the classroom teacher works with the Title I students. Another example

currently not allowed in New York State would be to have the compensatory specialist provide all instruction in a given subject (i.e., reading) rather than having the classroom teacher provide one period of instruction which is followed by a second period of supplemental instruction.

APPENDIX A

CLASSROOM TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. How many years have you been teaching?

2. Briefly describe the identification and selection procedure used in determining how children receive Title I services.

3. Once a student has been selected for the Title I program, what type of information

   (a) do you give to the Title I teacher

   (b) do you receive from the Title I teacher

4. How do you plan the instructional program (in reading and math) for those children in your class who are receiving Title I services (in reading and math)?

5. Do you have a system of periodic assessment of each participant's (Title I) progress?

6. How often do you receive a periodic assessment of progress from the Title I teacher for those children in your class who are receiving Title I services?

7. Who determines, and how is it determined, that a child no longer requires Title I services?

8. When it has been determined that a child no longer requires Title I services and is dropped from the Title I program, what type of report do you receive from the Title I teacher?

9. Is there a system of follow-up on a child who has been in a Title I program but because of satisfactory progress no longer receives Title I services?

10. How does the base program in reading and math differ from the Title I instructional program in these two content areas?

11. What steps have been taken to establish a coordination and continuity (an integration) between the tax levy base instruction and the instruction provided through Title I?

12. What is the single and most significant characteristic of the disadvantaged child that you could identify?

13. Given a minimum of governmental restrictions, what type of Title I program would you design to meet the needs of educationally deprived children?

INTERVIEW WITH DISTRICT PERSONNEL

1. The Federal Regulations state:

> "No project under Title I of the Act will be deemed to have been designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children unless the Federal funds made available for that project (i) will be used to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the level of State and local funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for the education of pupils participating in that project; (ii) will not be used to supplant State and local funds available for the education of such pupils;..."

(a) How do you interpret this section of the Regulations?

(b) Do you think that the Regulations are counter-productive to the intent of the Legislation?

2. Given a minimum of governmental restrictions, what type of Title I program would you design to meet the needs of educationally deprived children?

3. What changes in the Title I Regulations would you recommend?

4. What changes in State guidelines would you recommend?

5. Should an economic index be used as a basis for allocating money to school districts to provide educational services to children? (In other words, should the federal funding formulae be changed?)

6. What is the single and most significant characteristic of the disadvantaged child that you could identify?

7. When you are planning your Title I program do you include in the design of each project a specific plan for the coordination between the Title I instructional activities and the locally funded base instructional program?

8. In your experience with Title I, do you see the relationship between Title I services and the base education program as a problem area?

Title I TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. How many years have you been teaching in compensatory education?

2. Briefly describe the identification and selection procedure used in determining how children receive Title I services.

3. Once a student has been selected for the Title I program, what type of information

   (a) do you receive from the classroom teacher?

   (b) do you provide to the classroom teacher?

4. How do you plan the instructional program for each participant?

5. Do you have a system of periodic assessment of each participant's progress?

6. How often, and to whom, do you report on the progress of each participant?

7. Who determines, and how is it determined, that a child no longer requires Title I services?

8. When it has been determined that a child no longer requires Title I services and is dropped from the Title I program, what type of report is sent to the classroom teacher?

9. Is there a system of follow-up on a child who has been in a Title I program but because of satisfactory progress no longer receives Title I services?

10. How does the base program in reading and math differ from the Title I instructional program?

11. What steps have been taken to establish a coordination and continuity between the tax levy base instruction and the instruction provided through Title I?

12. What is the single and most significant characteristic of the disadvantaged child that you could identify?

13. Given a minimum of governmental restrictions, what type of Title I program would you design to meet the needs of educationally deprived children?

BUILDING PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

1. How many years have you been a school principal?

   _____ Of a Title I school _____

2. Briefly describe the identification and selection procedure used in determining how children receive Title I services.

3. Briefly describe the articulation procedure you have developed between the tax levy staff and the Title I staff.

4. How, how often, and by whom, are you kept informed of the Title I program?

5. Did (do) you participate in the planning and development of the Title I projects at your school?

6. The Federal Regulations state:

   "No project under Title I of the Act will be deemed to have been designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children unless the Federal funds made available for that project (i) will be used to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the level of State and local funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for the education of pupils participating in that project; (ii) will not be used to supplant State and local funds available for the education of such pupils;...

   (a) How do you interpret this section of the Regulations?

   (b) How does your Title I program supplement the base program funded from State and local resources?

   (c) Do you think that the Regulations are counter-productive to the intent of the legislation?

7. Given a minimum of governmental restrictions, what type of Title I program would you design to meet the needs of educationally deprived children?

8. What changes in the Title I Regulations would you recommend?

9. What changes in State guidelines would you recommend?

10. What is the single and most significant characteristic of the disadvantaged child that you could identify?